wine of cod-liver oil, it contained no extract of cod-liver oil combined with hypophosphites of quinine and strychnine; it did not represent the principal medicinal extracts of cod-liver oil; it was a preparation that offered no essential extractives of cod-liver oil and it was not a substitute for cod-liver oil. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding the therapeutic and curative effects of the article, appearing on the said cartons and bottles and in the said circular, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for the first stages of pulmonary tuberculosis, chronic muscular rheumatism, scrofulous lesions of the skin, dilated lymphatic glands, tertiary syphilis, marasmus, anemia, all affections of the respiratory tract, pulmonary tuberculosis, subacute, acute, and chronic bronchitis, laryngitis, obstinate cough with fetid and viscous expectoration, general debility due to faulty nutrition, intestinal tuberculosis, and chronic gastritis with fermentation; and effective to diminish the temperature and alleviate the cough in the different pulmonary affections where there exists fetid expectoration; and effective as a powerful stimulant and extraordinary nutritive agent; and effective in the treatment of nervous affections, general debility, and loss of vigor through physical or mental work, whereas it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On February 29, 1932, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $10.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19380. Adulteration and misbranding of mercury protoiodide tablets, quinine sulphate tablets, and salol tablets. U. S. v. Physicians' Chemical & Drug Co. Plea of not guilty. Judgment of guilty. Fine, $200 and costs. (F. & D. No. 22556. I. S. Nos. 15089-x, 15092-x, 15093-x, 15094-x.)

Examination of samples of drug tablets from the shipment herein described showed that the articles varied appreciably from the declared standard, since the quinine sulphate tablets contained less than the declared amount of quinine sulphate, and the mercury protoiodide tablets and the salol tablets contained more mercury protoiodide and salol, respectively, than labeled.

On April 17, 1928, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against the Physicians' Chemical & Drug Co., a corporation, Chicago, Ill., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about December 14, 1926, from the State of Illinois into the State of Louisiana, of quantities of drugs consisting of 1 lot of mercury protoiodide tablets, 2 lots of quinine sulphate tablets, and 1 lot of salol tablets, which said drugs were adulterated and misbranded. The articles were labeled in part, variously: "Mercury Protoiodide Gr. ¼;" "Quinine Sulphate Gr. 1 [or "Gr. 2"];" "Salol Grs. 2½ * * * The Physicians' Chemical and Drug Company, Chicago, Illinois."

It was alleged in the information that the articles were adulterated in that their strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which they were sold, as follows: Each of the said mercury protoiodide tablets was represented to contain ¼ grain of mercury protoiodide, whereas each one contained more than so represented, namely, not less than 0.281, i. e., approximately two-sevenths of a grain of mercury protoiodide. Each of the quinine sulphate tablets in one of the lots was represented to contain 1 grain of quinine sulphate, where each one contained less than so represented, namely, not more than 0.747 grain, i. e., ¾ grain of quinine sulphate. Each of the quinine sulphate tablets in the other lot was represented to contain 2 grains of quinine sulphate, whereas each one contained less than so represented, namely, not more than 1.728, i. e., 1¾ grains of quinine sulphate. Each of the salol tablets was represented to contain 2½ grains of salol, whereas each of said tablets contained more than so represented, to wit, not less than 5.077 grains of salol.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Mercury Protoiodide Gr. ¼ * * * Tablets," "Quinine Sulphate Gr. 1," "Quinine Sulphate Gr. 2," and "Salol Grs. 2½ * * * Tablets," borne on the labels of the respective products, were false and misleading in that the said statements represented that the articles contained the amount of the said drugs declared on the labels, whereas they did not, the said mercury protoiodide tablets and the salol tablets contained more of the said drugs than declared on

the labels, and the quinine sulphate tablets contained less quinine sulphate than so declared.

On January 27, 1932, a plea of not guilty to the information having been entered on behalf of the defendant company, the facts were submitted to the court who made a finding of guilty and imposed a fine of $200 and costs.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19381. Adulteration and misbranding of peroxide of hydrogen and misbranding of laxative cold tablets. U. S. v. Royal Manufacturing Co. of Duquesne. Plea of guilty. Fine, $100 and costs. (F. & D. No. 26637. I. S. Nos. 16238, 28745.)

Samples of peroxide of hydrogen involved in this action were found to fall below the requirements of the United States Pharmacopoeia since it contained less hydrogen peroxide and more preservative, in the form of acetanilid, than so provided. The labeling of the article failed to declare the amount of acetanilid contained therein. The bottle label of the peroxide of hydrogen, and the box label of the laxative cold tablets also covered by this action, contained unwarranted therapeutic and curative claims for the said articles.

On September 16, 1931, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against the Royal Manufacturing Co. of Duquesne, a corporation, trading at Duquesne, Pa., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, on or about March 20, 1931, from the State of Pennsylvania into the District of Columbia, of a quantity of peroxide of hydrogen that was adulterated and misbranded, and on or about March 18, 1931, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Virginia, of a quantity of laxative cold tablets that were misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the laxative cold tablets by this department showed that they consisted essentially of acetanilid, quinine sulphate, iron oxide, tolu, capsicum oleoresin, aloin, and podophyllum resin.

Adulteration of the said peroxide of hydrogen was alleged in the information for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said pharmacopoeia official at the time of investigation, in that it contained 1.6 per cent of hydrogen peroxide, equivalent to approximately 5.3 volumes of oxygen, and it contained as a preservative 0.28 gram of acetanilid in each 100 cubic centimeters, equivalent to 1.28 grains per fluid ounce of the article, whereas the pharmacopoeia provides that solution of hydrogen dioxide, i. e., solution of hydrogen peroxide, shall contain not less than 3 per cent by weight of hydrogen peroxide, and that any preservative present shall not exceed 0.04 gram per 100 cubic centimeters; and the standard of strength, quality, and purity of the article was not declared on the container. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the strength and purity of the article fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, in that it was represented to be peroxide of hydrogen 10 volume 3 per cent H_2O_2, a superior product of unexcelled purity and strength, whereas it was not.

Misbranding of the said peroxide of hydrogen was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Peroxide of Hydrogen * * * 10 Volume 3 per cent H_2O_2 A superior product of unexcelled purity, strength," borne on the bottle label, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was peroxide of hydrogen 10 volume, 3 per cent H_2O_2, a superior article of unexcelled purity and strength, whereas it was not; misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article contained acetanilid and the label failed to bear a statement of the quantity and proportion of acetanilid contained therein. Misbranding of the said peroxide of hydrogen was alleged for the further reason that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding the therapeutic and curative effects of the said article, appearing on the bottle label, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for catarrh of the nose and for hay fever, whereas it contained no ingredient or medicinal agents effective as a treatment, remedy, or cure for catarrh of the nose or for hay fever. Misbranding of the laxative cold tablets was alleged for the reason that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding the therapeutic and curative effects of the article, appearing on the box label, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for coughs, influenza, headaches, fever, and la